

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,605	09/28/2004		David W. Johnston	04-1-723 5604	
24252	7590	09/07/2005	•	EXAMINER	
OSRAM S			NGUYEN, TU T		
DANVERS,				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,				2877	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/711,605	JOHNSTON, DAVID W.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Tu T. Nguyen	2877					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
	-· action is non-final.						
·							
·	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.	· · · 						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 September 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau 	 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). 						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)	ary (PTO-413)					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2,4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cote et al (5,209,231) in view of Gobeli (6,246,893).

With respect to claim 1, Cote discloses a sequential arrangement. The arrangement comprises: a light source 10 (fig 1), a first polarizer 14 (fig 1), a quarter wave plate 16 (fig 1), a second polarizer 18 (fig 1) substantially aligned along a central axis; the orientation of the first polarizer to the quarter wave plate being fixed, and the second polarizer being rotatable 22 (fig 1) (column 6, lines 30-35) about the central axis.

Cote does not disclose an LED. Gobeli discloses a polarization arrangement.

The arrangement comprises: an LED 2 (fig 2) (column 5, lines 44-45). It would have been obvious to modify Cote with the LED as taught by Gobeli to reduce the cost of the system.

With respect to claims 2,4,9, it would have been obvious to modify Cote with a LED having any desired wavelength range to measure different type of samples.

With respect to claim 5, Cote discloses using a polarizing film (column 6, line 13).

With respect to claim 6, Cote does not disclose a moveable quarter plate.

However, it would have been obvious to modify Cote with a moveable quarter plate to measure different characteristics of the sample.

Page 3

With respect to claim 7, Cote discloses a controller 22 (fig 1) for controlling the degree of rotation of the second polarizer. Cote does not explicitly disclose an indica for determining the degree of rotation. The claimed indica would have been known in the art. It would have been obvious to modify Cote with the known indica to control the degree of rotation of the second polarizer more accurate.

With respect to claim 8, Cote does not disclose the extinction ratio as claimed. However, it would have been obvious to modify Cote polarizer film 14 (fig 1) with any desired extinction ratio to measure different characteristics of the sample.

Claims 3,10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cote et al (5,209,231) in view of Gobeli (6,246,893) and Oldenbourg et al (6,924,893).

With respect to claims 3,10, Cote does not disclose using a plurality of LEDs.

Oldenbourg discloses a polarization arrangement. The arrangement comprises: a plurality of LEDs (column 16, lines 65-67 and column 17, lines 1-5). Oldenbourg does not explicitly disclose providing an even illumination field. It would have been obvious to modify Cote with a plurality of LEDs as taught by Oldenbourg to provide an even illumination field to make the system more accurate.

Application/Control Number: 10/711,605 Page 4

Art Unit: 2877

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tu T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2424. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F 7:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Toatley Jr. can be reached on (571) 272-2800 Ext. 77. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tu T. Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit 2877

Durzuyen